[1st February 1936

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 689 asked by Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 1st February 1936, at page 341 supra.]

(1)

G.O. Ms. No. 677, Public (Police), dated 14th December 1935.

READ—the following paper:—

G.O. No. 629, Public (Police), dated 14th December 1934.

Order—No. 677, *Public (Police), dated 14th December* 1935.

The Government direct that the additional police force of one Sub-Inspector and seven constables stationed in the Attayampatti village, Salem district under G.O. No. 629, Public (Police), dated the 14th December 1934 be withdrawn with effect from the 1st January 1936. The District Magistrate of Salem is requested to make it perfectly clear to the inhabitants of that village that if there be any recrudescence of the trouble additional police will be reimposed and the cost recovered from them under section 15 of the Indian Police Act (V of 1861).

(By order of the Governor in Council)

C. F. BRACKENBURY,
Chief Secretary.

To the Inspector-General of Police, with reference to his R.C. No. 2016-1/35, Audit, dated the 3rd December 1935.
,, District Magistrate of Salem.
,, Accountant-General.

(2)

Report of the District Magistrate, Salem, R.O.C. No. 4573-*M*/34-*D*-1, *dated the 22nd November* 1935.

I agree that the punitive police may be withdrawn with effect from the 1st January 1936. The stationing of the police in the village for the last three years and the payment of punitive tax at a time of economic depression has, I think, driven home the lesson to the villagers that disorder in the village does not pay.